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Introduction

- We are interested in optimizing meshes for multi-material ALE Hydrodynamics [1]. For $N$ materials and a material index $k = 1 \ldots N$, the system of interest is:

\[
\frac{d\eta_k}{dt} = \alpha_k \tag{1}
\]

\[
\frac{d(\eta_k \rho_k)}{dt} = -\eta_k \rho_k \nabla \cdot u \tag{2}
\]

\[
\rho_k \frac{du}{dt} = \nabla \cdot \sum_k \eta_k \sigma_k \tag{3}
\]

\[
\eta_k \rho_k \frac{de_k}{dt} = \eta_k \sigma_k \cdot \nabla u - \bar{\rho} \alpha_k \tag{4}
\]
Introduction

- Why mesh optimization?

  3D triple point problem on a static mesh and on a moving mesh with Lagrangian framework.

- Lagrangian meshes can get large deformations which lead to small time step size or even tangling of the finite elements.

- Static meshes can lead to numerical dissipation as materials evolve in time.

- Mesh optimization can help reduce numerical dissipation and prevent mesh tangling.
  - Also improve computational efficiency of the calculation (#dofs for a given accuracy).
Target Matrix Optimization Paradigm (TMOP)

- Any Jacobian transformation can be represented using four geometric parameters:

  \[
  W = \begin{bmatrix}
  \zeta & R \\
  [volume] & [rotation]
  \end{bmatrix}
  \begin{bmatrix}
  Q & D \\
  [skewness] & [aspect-ratio]
  \end{bmatrix}
  \]

- The transformation \( T \) from the active to target element can be defined using the Jacobian transformation \( A \) and \( W \).
TMOP Mesh Quality Metrics

- Quality metric $\mu(T)$ is a measure of the deviation between the active and target Jacobian transformation.

- Different metrics depend on different geometric parameters.
  - Shape metric - depends on Skew (Q) and Aspect-ratio (D). $\mu_2(T) = 0.5 \frac{|T|^2}{\det(T)} - 1$
  - Size metric - depends on $\zeta$. $\mu_{77}(T) = 0.5 \left( \det(T) - \frac{1}{\det(T)} \right)^2$

- Other kinds include Alignment, Shape + Size, Shape + Alignment, etc.

  Over 100 different metrics divided into 8 metric types.

- We typically deploy metrics that control shape and size of the elements, but seldom also use metrics for mesh alignment.
\section*{r-adaptivity with TMOP}

- Using the quality metric and the Jacobian transformation $T$, the TMOP objective function is defined as:

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{M}} F_E(\mathbf{x}_E) = \sum_{E(\mathbf{x}_E)} \int_{E_t} \omega(\mathbf{x}) \mu(T(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}_t$$

where $\mathbf{x}$ represents mesh coordinates, $\omega$ is a user-defined spatial weight. The element-by-element integral is computed as:

$$\sum_{E \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{E_t} \omega(\mathbf{x}_t) \mu(T(\mathbf{x}_t)) d\mathbf{x}_t = \frac{1}{N_E} \sum_{E \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_q \in E_t} w_q \det(W(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_q)) \omega(\mathbf{x}_q) \mu(T(\mathbf{x}_q))$$

- In practice, we can use multiple metrics with different spatial weights.

- $r$-adaptivity - $F(\mathbf{x})$ is minimized using a technique such as the Newton’s method to optimize the mesh [2].
Target Construction

- Use of TMOP relies on choice of $W$ and a compatible quality metric.

- $W$ is defined using any combination of the four geometric parameters based on the mesh optimization goal. [3]

- For practical implementations, $W$ is derived from discrete simulation data at run-time.

- Consider a simple 2D example where the material interface is not aligned with the mesh:

Simulation data - material indicator ($\eta$)
Target Construction

Simulation data

material indicator ($\eta$)

Size - $\zeta \propto 1/|\nabla \eta|$

Aspect-Ratio - $\rho \propto |\eta_x/\eta_y|$

\[
W = \sqrt{\zeta} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cos \phi \\ 0 & \sin \phi \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\rho} \end{bmatrix},
\]

- $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}$ for an ideal square.
- Use a Shape + Size metric, $\mu_7 = |T - T^t|^2$
Discrete Function Transfer During and After Mesh Optimization

- During and after mesh-optimization, the discrete functions must be mapped from the original mesh to the moved mesh.
  - Interpolation using FindPoints [4], $x_s \in \Omega_s \rightarrow e, r \in \Omega_0$
  - PDE-based remap [5], $\tau \in [0,1]$, $u = x_s - x_0$

\[
\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \tau} = u \cdot \nabla \eta, \quad \eta(x_0,0) = \eta_0(x_0)
\]
$h$-adaptivity

- Effectiveness of $r$-adaptivity can be limited due to the topology of the original mesh.

- $h$-adaptivity introduces additional degrees of freedom by splitting existing elements.

- Nonconforming high-order mesh refinement framework introduced by Cerveny et al. [6]
  
  - Supports nonconforming isotropic and anisotropic refinement/derefinement in 2D and 3D for triangles/quads and tetrahedrons/cubes.
  
  - Requires use of an error estimator for refinement/derefinement decisions during simulation.
AMR for Mesh Optimization

- Anisotropic refinements impact the shape and size of an element, and isotropic refinement impacts only the size of an element.

- Refinements also impact skew, but this impact cannot be directly controlled.
TMOP-based Refinement Error Estimator

- Based on $\mu$, define $\Gamma$ as the set of refinement types to be considered:
  - Shape metric - $\gamma = 1,2$ in 2D and 1-6 in 3D.
  - Size metric - $\gamma = 3$ in 2D and 7 in 3D.
  - Shape + Size metric - $\gamma = 1 – 3$ in 2D and 1-7 in 3D.

- For a given element $E$ and refinement type $\gamma$:

\[
\Delta F_E^\gamma = F_E^{\gamma=0} - \frac{F_E^\gamma}{N_c},
\]

where $F_E^\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} F_{E_c}$

\[
F_E = \sum_{x_q \in E} w_q \det(W(\bar{x}_q)) \omega(x_q) \mu(T(x_q))
\]

- Refinement type is picked based on: $\max_\gamma \Delta F_E^\gamma, \gamma \in \Gamma$
TMOP-based Refinement Error Estimator

- In practice, determining $F^\gamma_E$ requires the element $E$ being considered to be refined and all discrete functions must be mapped to its children $E_c$.
  - Trivial via finite element interpolation matrices that can be robustly constructed for a given $\gamma$. 

Derefinement is important for time-dependent problems where regions that require resolution can change with time.

Elements that are already refined, are considered for derefinement:

- If $E_p$ is an element that was refined to span $N_c$ children at a previous iteration:
  
  \[
  \Delta F_{E_p} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \frac{F_{E_c}}{N_c} - F_{E_p}
  \]

  Difference in energy for a derefinement.

- $\Delta F^r_E$ for refinement and $\Delta F_{E_p}$ for derefinement are compliments of each other.
**hr-adaptivity**

- $x_0$ - original mesh
- $\mu$ - TMOP quality metric
- $\epsilon$ - Newton convergence
- $N_h$ - $h$-adaptivity iterations per step.

**Target construction**

- $N_R$ - Number of elements refined at previous iteration metric
- $N_D$ - Number of elements derefined at previous iteration

**r-adaptivity with Newton’s method ($\epsilon$)**

- $N_h$ iterations of $h$-adaptivity

**Algorithm 1: hr—adaptivity**

**Input:** $x_0$, $\mu$, $\epsilon$, $N_h$.

**Output:** $x_s$ (initialized to $x_0$).

1. Construct $W_i$ for each integration-point $i$ using target-construction. [25]

2. while $N_R \neq 0$ or $N_D \neq 0$ do

   3. $r$—adaptivity:

   4. $x_s \rightarrow \arg\min_x \sum_{E \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{q \in E} w_q \det(W(x_q)) \omega(x_q) \mu(T(x_q))$. [1]

   5. $h$—adaptivity:

   6. for $i \in 1 \ldots N_h$ do

      7. $\forall E_p \in \mathcal{M}$, determine $\Delta F_{E_p}$. [10] [Derefinement estimator]

      8. Derefine element $E_p$ if $\Delta F_{E_p} > 0$.

      9. $\forall E \in \mathcal{M}$, determine $\Delta F_{E}^\gamma \forall \gamma \in \Gamma$. [7] [Refinement estimator]

      10. Refine element $E$ based on $\max_{\gamma} \Delta F_{E}^\gamma$. [13]

   11. end

12. end

• Note: quality metric can be different for $r$- and $h$-adaptivity component.
Application I - 2D Benchmark Using Poisson Equation

- Solve the Poisson problem:

\[ \nabla^2 u = f, \quad \Omega = [0,1]^2 \]

with a known exact solution to mimic a sharp circular wave front of radius \( r \) centered at \((x_c, y_c)\)

\[ u = \arctan \left( \alpha \left( \sqrt{(x-x_c)^2 + (y-y_c)^2} - r \right) \right) \]

- \( \alpha = 200, \ (x_c, y_c) = (-0.05, -0.05), \ r = 0.7 \)
Application I - 2D Benchmark Using Poisson Equation

- Target construction using gradient of the discrete function on the mesh, as earlier.

\[ W = \sqrt{\epsilon} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cos \phi \\ 0 & \sin \phi \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\rho} \end{bmatrix} \]

- To compare \( h \)-, \( r \)-, and \( hr \)-adaptivity, we start with a mesh and do 1 iteration of \( h \)- and/or \( r \)-adaptivity, using a Shape + Size metric.

h-adaptivity  

r-adaptivity  

hr-adaptivity
Application I - 2D Benchmark Using Poisson Equation

- Error comparison for different adaptivity techniques shows effectiveness of $hr$-adaptivity.
- $hr$-adaptivity requires 66% fewer degrees of freedoms in comparison to $r$-adaptivity for a given accuracy in the solution.
Application II - Analytic adaptivity

(a) $\mu^r_7$ (Shape + Size metric), $\mu^h_{55}$ (Size metric)

(b) $\mu_7$ (Shape + Size metric)
Application II - Analytic adaptivity

(c) $\mu_7^r$ (Shape + Size metric), $\mu_{55}^h$ (Size metric)

(d) $\mu_7^r$ (Shape + Size metric), $\mu_{55}^h$ (Size metric)
Application III - ALE Hydrodynamics 2D gas impactor

- Large mesh deformations lead to mesh tangling in Lagrangian framework.
- TMOP-based $r$- and $hr$-adaptivity improves mesh quality and provides resolution in regions with material interaction:
  - Shape + Size metric for $r$- and Shape metric for $h$-adaptivity component.
  - Material indicator used for target construction.
Application IV - ALE Hydrodynamics 3D Triple Point

- 3D triple point problem [9].
- Shape + Size metric for $r$- and Size metric for $h$-adaptivity component.

To quantify the comparison between these meshes, we look at how well the original material indicator can be represented on each of the meshes in comparison to the mesh from Lagrangian framework.

$$
e = \int_{\Omega} \left( \eta_L(x_L) - \eta(x_s) \right)^2$$

(a) Lagrangian mesh

\[ \eta_L(x_L) \]

(b) Original mesh
Application IV - ALE Hydrodynamics 3D Triple Point

- Volumetric error is almost an order of magnitude lower for the $hr$–adaptivity mesh in comparison to $r$–adaptivity and about 20x lower in comparison to the uniform hexahedron mesh.

\[ \eta_L(x_L) \]

\[ e = 1.71 \]

\[ e = 0.62 \]

\[ e = 0.078 \]
Conclusion & Future Work

- TMOP-based mesh optimization enables $hr$-adaptivity for nonconforming high-order meshes.

- Novel element-by-element TMOP-based energy estimator determine elements and corresponding refinement type for $h$-adaptivity.

- Physics-dependent mesh optimization can significantly improve the computational performance of a mesh by reducing the number of degrees of freedom required for a given accuracy in the solution.

Future work:

- Integrate $hr$-adaptivity framework in the Laghos miniapp for optimization at runtime.

- Explore integration of $p$-adaptivity in $hr$-adaptivity framework.
MFEM open source implementation

- All presented methods are (or will be) available in MFEM.
- MFEM contains **various** 2D and 3D mesh quality metrics, and different 6 target construction methods.
- Modular framework allows additional metrics and target construction approaches to be robustly integrated.
- User interface provided by the `mesh_optimizer` and `pmesh_optimizer` miniapps.
  - Choice of target construction / quality metric / adaptivity fields / parameters.
  - Visualization through GLVis.
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